

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

EDMUND KEITH BRADSHAW,

Plaintiff,

v.

**OREGON STATE POLICE
DEPARTMENT; IDENTIFICATION
SERVICES SECTION; CHRIS P. BROWN,
Superintendent; M. KELLY; JOHN DOE 1-
10, et al.; COUNSELOR EDSALL,**

Defendants.

Case No. 6:14-cv-00717-JE

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge John Jelderks issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on January 27, 2016. Dkt. 55. Judge Jelderks recommended that the Court deny Plaintiff's motion to stay and dismiss this action. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review de novo magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Jelderk’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Judge Jelderk’s Findings and Recommendation, Dkt. 55. Plaintiff’s motion to stay (Dkt. 53) is **DENIED** and this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. The Court further finds that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith and Plaintiff’s in forma pauperis status should be revoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 17th day of February, 2016.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge